

# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/466,400	12/17/99	FRIEDOW		M	10191/1172
026646 KENYON & KENYON ONE BROADWAY		MM91/0821	7		EXAMINER
		the state of the s		LEON,E	
NEW YORK NY 10004				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2833	
				DATE MAILED:	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

08/21/01

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/466,400	FRIEDOW ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Edwin A. León	2833	
The MAILI Period for Reply	ING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet will	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED THE MAILING D - Extensions of time in after SIX (6) MONTH - If the period for reply - If NO period for reply - Failure to reply within - Any reply received by	O STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REID ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR HS from the mailing date of this communication. It is specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a register of the set of extended period for reply will, by state of the provided HS of the main three months after the main adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thir iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON title cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed  ty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication.	
1)⊠ Responsi	ive to communication(s) filed on 1	<u>3 July 2001</u> .		
2a)☐ This actio	on is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.		
3)☐ Since this closed in	s application is in condition for allo accordance with the practice unde	wance except for formal mai er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I	tters, prosecution as to the merits is D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Clair	ms			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1</u>	1-16 is/are pending in the applicati	ion.		
4a) Of the a	above claim(s) is/are withdo	rawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) _	is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1</u> .	-16 is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) _	is/are objected to.			
8)∏ Claims	are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.		
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specifi	cation is objected to by the Exami	iner.		
10)☐ The drawin	g(s) filed on is/are objected	d to by the Examiner.		
11) The propos	sed drawing correction filed on	is: a) approved b)	disapproved.	
12) The oath or	r declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.		
Priority under 35 U.	S.C. <b>§</b> 119			
13)⊠ Acknowled	gment is made of a claim for foreig	gn priority under 35 U.S.C.	i 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
	Some * c) None of:		(4) (4) (5) (7)	
1.⊠ Certi	fied copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.		
	fied copies of the priority documer		oplication No.	
3.∐ Copie a	es of the certified copies of the pri- pplication from the International B ched detailed Office action for a lis	ority documents have been r Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	received in this National Stage	
	gement is made of a claim for dom			
Attachment(s)				
	es Cited (PTO-892) son's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	19) Notice of I	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2833

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed May 10, 2001 in which Claims 1 and 3-5 and 12-13 have been amended and Claim 2 has been added, has been place of record in the file as Paper No. 7.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Togashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,772,470). With regard to Claims 1 and 4, Togashi discloses a device for contacting an electrically operated apparatus, comprising: at least one terminal contact (bottom of Fig. 1) on a side of the apparatus, the at least one terminal contact (bottom of Fig. 1) being oriented parallel to an installation direction of the apparatus; and a plug (50) including at least one sleeve contact (11), the at least one sleeve contact (11) and the at least one terminal contact (bottom of Fig. 1) being adapted to be assembled together parallel to the installation direction and the at least

Page 2

one sleeve contact (11) including two concentric sleeve contacts (11). See Column 5, Lines 6-13 and Figs. 1-5.

Togashi discloses the claimed invention except for the at least one terminal including two concentric terminal contacts, the two sleeve contacts connecting the two terminal contacts. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have the at least one terminal including two concentric terminal contacts, the two sleeve contacts connecting the two terminal contacts, since applicant has not disclose that this feature is a critical, patentably distinguishing feature and the invention would perform equally well with a single terminal contact (bottom of Fig. 1) as shown in Fig. 1 of Togashi.

With regard to Claim 3, Togashi discloses the sleeve contacts (11) are each in contact with the terminal contact (bottom of Fig. 1) on an outside circumference when joined together. See Column 5, Lines 6-13 and Figs. 1-5.

With regard to Claim 5, Togashi discloses insulation situated between the terminal contact (bottom of Fig. 1). See Column 5, Lines 6-13 and Figs. 1-5.

With regard to Claim 6, Togashi discloses the insulation includes an insulating sleeve composed of a plastic. See Column 5, Lines 6-13 and Figs. 1-5.

With regard to Claim 7, Togashi discloses a back wall (56) of the plug acts as a further insulation which, together with the insulation between the terminal contact (bottom of Fig. 1), form two contact chambers insulated from one another. See Column 5, Lines 6-13 and Figs. 1-5.

With regard to Claim 8, Togashi discloses the at least one sleeve contact (11) includes an interior sleeve contact and an exterior sleeve contact, a printed conductor of

Art Unit: 2833

Page 4

the interior sleeve contact passing through a recess in the exterior sleeve contact. See Column 5, Lines 6-13 and Figs. 1-5.

With regard to Claim 9, Togashi discloses the at least one sleeve contact (11) includes a cylindrical segment. See Column 5, Lines 6-13 and Figs. 1-5.

With regard to Claim 10, Togashi discloses the at least one sleeve contact (11) having polygonal cross section. See Column 5, Lines 6-13 and Figs. 1-5.

With regard to Claim 11, Togashi discloses the at least one sleeve contact (11) has a diameter so as to overcome a predetermined contacting force when connected. See Column 5, Lines 6-13 and Figs. 1-5.

With regard to Claim 12, Togashi discloses the sleeve contacts (11) have inclined insertion guides. See Column 5, Lines 6-13 and Figs. 1-5.

With regard to Claim 13, Togashi discloses a plurality of punched grid conductors (101) connected to the plug (50). See Column 5, Lines 6-13 and Figs. 1-5 and 20-22.

With regard to Claim 14, Togashi discloses a first of the sleeve contacts (11) and a first of the punched grid conductors (101) are a one-piece unit, and a second of the sleeve contacts (11) and a second of the punched grid conductors (101) are a one-piece unit. See Column 5, Lines 6-13 and Figs. 1-5 and 20-22.

With regard to Claim 15, Togashi discloses the sleeve contacts (11) are formed by one of bending and folding the punched grid conductors (101). See Column 5, Lines 6-13 and Figs. 1-5 and 20-22.

4. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Togashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,772,470) in view of Beloritsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,036,540). With

Art Unit: 2833

Page 5

regard to Claim 15, Togashi discloses the claimed invention except for the sleeve contact being configured to substantially surround a respective one of the terminal contacts when the at least one sleeve contact and the at least one terminal contact are assembled.

Beloritsky discloses a contact (10) which surrounds a terminal contact (25). See Figs. 1-3.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Togashi by including a contact which surrounds a terminal contact as taught in Beloritsky to improve the electrical connection between both contacts.

## Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed May 10, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument regarding Claim 1 that the references do not show the at least one terminal including two concentric terminal contacts, the two sleeve contacts connecting the two terminal contacts, it is the Examiner's opinion that the invention would work the same with a single terminal contact as shown in Fig. 1 of Togashi.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was

Art Unit: 2833

within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. *In re Nomiya*, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1975). However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re McLaughlin*, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). References are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. *In re Bozek*, In this case, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Togashi by including a contact which surrounds a terminal contact as taught in Beloritsky to improve the electrical connection between both contacts.

Art Unit: 2833

Page 7

#### Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edwin A. León whose telephone number is (703) 308-6253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley can be reached on (703) 308-2319. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Paula Bradley
Supervisory Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2800